	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/884,921	PERETTI, MARCO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christopher A. Revak	2131
All Participants:	Status of Application: r	esponse to non-final
(1) Christopher A. Revak.	(3)	
(2) <u>Cameron Beddard</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 9 May 2007	Time:	
	cant's representative)	
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: n/a		
Claims discussed: 1,10,18,22		
Prior art documents discussed: Galipeau et al, US Patent 5,799,141		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	IERAL NATURE OF WHAT W	'AS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summ 	The examiner will provide a ware record of the substance of t	ritten summary of the substance the interview, since the interview
		·
(Examiner/SPIE Signature) (Applica	ant/Applicant's Representative	Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner and applicant's representative discussed the prior art reference of Galipeau in attempt to compact prosecution in order to overcome the reference. The examiner noted that the proposed amendment did not have support in the applicant's specification, however upon further consideration, the examiner indicated that dependent claim 10 was not taught by the prior art teachings and suggested incorporating the limitation from claim 10 into indepenent claims 1,18, and 22. The applicant agreed to an examiner's amendment in order to compact prosecution.